

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/604,883
Docket No.: 10766-US-PA

REMARKS

Present Status of the Application

The Office Action rejected claims 2, 9, 13, 16, 17, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicants have amended claims 2, 13, 16, and 17 to improve clarity.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1, 3-8, 10-12, 14-15, and 18-19 are allowed. Applicants appreciate the allowance that the Examiner made to claims 1, 3-8, 10-12, 14-15, and 18-19. While allowed claims 1, 3-8, 10-12, 14-15, and 18-19 remain unchanged, the allowance made thereto is also solicited to be remained.

Discussion of Office Action Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

1. The Office Action rejected claims 2 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In response to the rejection to claims 2 and 13, Applicants have add a limitation "relative to a horizontal" in claims 2 and 13 so as to more explicitly

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/604,883
Docket No.: 10766-US-PA

describe the angle of the oblique evaporation. The support can be found in paragraph [0021] and figure 1B. As such, Applicant submits that claims 2 and 13 are now in condition for allowance.

2. The Office Action rejected claims 9 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for at least the reasons set forth below.

In response to the rejection to claims 9 and 20, Applicants have amended the phrase "size" into "diameter". As such, Applicant submits that claims 2 and 13 are now in condition for allowance.

3. The Office Action rejected claims 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In response to the rejection to claims 16 and 17, Applicants have amended claims 16 and 17 to dependent from claim 15. As such, Applicant submits that claims 16 and 17 are now in condition for allowance.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that all presently pending claims 1-20 patentably define over the prior art references, and should be allowed.